

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 988

PC 014 441

AUTHOR Ledesma, Antonio L. Ed.; Ledesma, Angelita Y., Ed.
TITLE The Bandungan Papers: Guidelines for the Evaluation of Rural Development Projects of NGOs. CENDHRRA Development Memo Number 4.

INSTITUTION Centre for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Asia, Manila (Philippines).

PUB DATE Nov 80

NOTE 18p.; Report based on the Centre for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Asia (CENDHRRA) Evaluation Seminar (Bandungan, Central Java, Indonesia, May 4-9, 1980).

AVAILABLE FROM CENDHRRA, P.O. Box 458, Greenhills, San Juan, Metro Manila, Philippines.

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Citizen Participation; *Community Development; Community Health Services; Community Involvement; Drinking Water; *Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Needs; Leadership Training; Management Information Systems; Participant Satisfaction; Participative Decision Making; *Program Evaluation; Reports; *Rural Development; Statistical Data; Use Studies

IDENTIFIERS *Asia; *Non Governmental Organizations; Participative Evaluation

ABSTRACT

A collection of papers, from the Centre for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Asia (CENDHRRA) Evaluation Seminar (1980) in Bandungan, Central Java, provides guidelines for evaluation of rural development projects of non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The first part of the report contains a summary of group discussions on different aspects of evaluation, including placement of development projects within broader national policies; evaluation purposes, objectives and procedures; utilization of evaluation results; and perspectives on specific aspects, such as profiles of rural projects, listing development indicators, and in-built evaluation through reporting systems. A section on recommendations to CENDHRRA concerns CENDHRRA's role in helping project evaluations. The second part contains five case studies of projects; summaries of two resource papers; and sections on incidental thoughts on evaluation, evaluation apprehensions, difficulties of evaluating NGO projects, and CENDHRRA's evaluation services. Case studies cover evaluation of a scholarship program for social leadership training (Indonesia); an in-built participative evaluation of the Usaha Bersama movement (people joining together in socioeconomic activity to achieve a certain objective) (Java); community-based integrated rural development (South Korea); a Merapi Slopes drinking water project (Indonesia); and the utilization of community health services (Philippines). Summarized resource papers discuss a system for project evaluation through reports and a community-level information statistics system. (MH)

ED235988

The Bandung Papers
Guidelines for the Evaluation of
Rural Development Projects of NGOs

By

Antonio L. Ledesma, Ed.

Angelita Y. Ledesma, Ed.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Antonio L. Ledesma

CENDHRA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

November 1980

RC014441



CENDHRRRA

DEVELOPMENT MEMO

Number 4

November, 1980

EVALUATION

THE BANDUNGAN PAPERS

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS OF NGOs



This report is based on the CENDHRRRA Evaluation Seminar held in Bandung, Central Java, Indonesia from May 4-9, 1980. The first part is a summary of group discussions on different aspects of evaluation. Stressing the humanistic and cultural dimensions of development projects and processes, the discussions pointed to definite perspectives which are deemed essential in evaluation work. The second part briefly describes the case studies presented at the seminar.

Part I. SUMMARY OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS

A. Situating Development Projects

1. *The Context of Development Projects.* It is useful to situate development projects within the broader perspective of national policies that define whether a country is committed to an "integrated rural development" approach, to "export-oriented agriculture," to "basic needs" strategies and the like.

Since the majority of rural projects by NGOs are funded externally, the development policies of donor countries towards the Third World should also be analyzed. These studies can make us aware of the politics of aid, identify official aid priorities that could cancel out efforts in the NGO sector, and possibly encourage NGO's to point out such contradictions and to be a countervailing group to pressure for more positive policies affecting their sphere of work.

2. *Strengthening NGO Projects.* The efforts of NGO projects remain isolated and inconsequential unless they link themselves into networks of complementing agencies and resources. One important output of such linkages is information sharing. Another is exchange of expertise. Many NGO experiences are underutilized or completely lost for lack of documentation capability. Through linkages the impact of successful projects is maximized. The underlying development processes can be shared beyond a completed project — in the pursuit of other projects.

B. Perspectives on General Aspects of Evaluation

1. *Purposes of Evaluation* Of the varied purposes of evaluation, that of initiating an educative process among project holders, beneficiaries and donors may be of greater importance than the achievement of a highly sophisticated evaluation process that serves only academic interests.

This educative process results in a more efficient attainment of project goals from the standpoint of project holders and beneficiaries; and in more realistic policy-decisions from the standpoint of donors.

2. *Objectives and Expectations of All Parties Involved in an Evaluation.* The group felt that in evaluation of projects that directly affect lives of people — as are the activities of most NGO projects — it is only fair that from the beginning the objectives and expectations regarding the outcomes and consequences of an evaluation be stated openly. In a sense an evaluation procedure is a reflection of consensus among

those involved. Participation increases commitment and responsibility. Acceptance of evaluation results requires a sincere dialogue and degree of disinterestedness, risking to discover even negative results.

3. *Utilizing Evaluation Results.* In order to maximize the use of evaluation results and recommendations, the different parties concerned should take part as directly as is feasible in its conceptualization and design. It should be possible to relate the results of the evaluation to specific aspects of a project that are of interest to them or where their responsibilities lie. In this way, courses of action for improving programs are clear. Results that are too general are less helpful. Recommendations for improvement should also be concretely stated.

4. *Evaluation Procedures*

(a) Who should evaluate?

A number of observations were made on the limitations of a purely scientific approach in comprehending a project. Often, the advantages of scientific and objective evaluation methodologies do not compensate for the lack of deeper understanding of non-quantifiable elements that pertain to the inner essence of a project and which may prove to be more meaningful in its assessment.

The combined efforts of an external evaluator, the project holders (who normally make an internal evaluation of their activities), and those whose lives are affected by a project could bring out the objective and subjective elements of the project. In human resource development particularly, the subjective elements — values and meanings that people give to their actions, cannot be ignored. These can be learned through our most natural way of finding out things: human dialogue.

This is a dialogue based on friendship. Sincerity dispels suspicion. In a relationship of friendship it is possible to reveal weaknesses with a feeling of security. Mutual assistance requires an element of empathy.

But if these conditions are to be introduced in an evaluation methodology, how should evaluation instruments be designed?

(b) The adequacy of evaluation methods and instruments.

Research instruments are unable to sensibly describe or interpret the informal area in which projects operate. Unlike the formal sphere where technological considerations operate, the informal is made up of qualitative and cultural

factors. It is in this cultural area that man defines his true self and which is concerned with human purpose, human potential, human fulfillment. To convert the human problems of a project into a technological problem so it can be quantitatively measured is to distort the true essence of projects.

Thus the evaluation instruments should reflect the circumstances and conditions (which may be in flux) in which human activities take place. Basically, they reflect a culture and respect for local values. In the interpretation of results, value positions should be made explicit. Varied interpretations coming from the different parties involved in the evaluation should be consolidated. In this way the partiality of evaluation instruments may be rectified. The validity and reliability of results would come then from the usual rigorous requirements of a scientific program and the common understanding and synthesis that emanates from discussions of various possible interpretations. This result is possible only through open, participative dialogue.

C. *Perspectives on Specific Aspects*

1. *Profile of Rural Projects.* The typical project is made up of these aspects and in an evaluation process it is important to identify which are being evaluated and which are outside its scope: (a) context (b) objectives (c) structure: administration and management (d) programs (e) mechanism for implementation (f) community it services (g) external linkages (h) constraints (i) resources: physical and manpower.

2. *Listing of Development Indicators.* It is useful to compile lists of important indicators associated with the attainment of each project objective. As much as possible these indicators should include a time frame specifying when results are expected to be accomplished. They should also clearly specify at what level: individual, community, township, national — their impact is being assessed. Furthermore, these indicators should be drawn up with the participation of all those involved: project staff, recipients, donors, evaluators.

3. *In-built Evaluation Through a Reporting System.* A methodical way of reporting would be a normal part of project implementation. Reports are assessed against objectives and target goals. But it is increasingly recognized that an evaluation design which is built into a project from its planning stage and carried through its various phases, assures greater

effectiveness. This process, described in the literature as "formative evaluation" includes these components: criteria against which actual performance is assessed; factors to indicate achievement; and the means to introduce modifications or changes. The corrective mechanism which is applied at problem points of an on-going project would strengthen the project.

However, this process depends on accurate reports. A system of reporting presented by INDHRRRA in this Seminar (included in Part II) stresses a feature that follows the approach of data gathering and interpretation discussed above (point 4). The formulation of reports is through discussions among the participants of a project and represents a synthesis. By thinking about and discussing matters together, the participants gain insights which become sources for improvements. The reporting system is not simply a collection of quantitative data, but represents a dynamic process of reflection. This kind of information may serve as a basis for evaluation.

D. Recommendations Submitted to CENDHRRRA

1. It is important in CENDHRRRA's work to continuously bring out the cultural values of Asian communities and to articulate the underlying philosophy of Asian peoples which cherish and nourish the humanistic elements of development. In assessing man and his actions, in defining his needs, his inner potential must be considered as this is the source of growth that we are concerned with.
2. Formulating evaluation methodologies and instruments may be situation-specific, but there is need also to continually refine a process of combining the scientific and cultural approaches to evaluation. Such methodologies and instruments must reflect the life of people. CENDHRRRA should contribute its efforts towards this end.
3. As a policy, self-evaluation of groups undertaking projects should be encouraged; evaluation skills should be encouraged among project management. Thus, openness towards evaluation is fostered among CENDHRRRA contacts.
4. CENDHRRRA should form evaluation teams composed of university specialists and veteran practitioners of particular projects, of external and internal evaluators who subscribe to the use of evaluation for raising the standards of project management and implementation.
5. Formulation of a typology of projects, characteristic of network partners and providing corresponding general guidelines for evaluation.
6. To conduct training programs on evaluation perspectives and methodologies for CENDHRRRA network partners.
7. To work towards a better mutual understanding of the respective philosophy and cultures of donor countries and assisted partners in order to appreciate the nature of constraints affecting their relationships; to build true solidarity and friendship. Donor agencies also need to evaluate their work and commitments, and in this relationship of solidarity they will appreciate their own contributions to integral human development.

BANDUNGAN PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Sarino Mangonpranoto — former Minister of Education, government of Indonesia; now with SFMA, community integrated agricultural high school in Ungaran, Central Java.

Mr. Bambang Ismawan — INDHRRRA and YSTM

Mr. Djoko Aminoto — INDHRRRA

Ibu Emmy Miryam — KSED

Mr. Sombat Nunthavichitra — Credit Union League of Thailand

Dr. Ji Woong Cheong — Korea DHRRA and Seoul National University

Mr. Richard Holloway — OXFAM

Mrs. Clare Holloway — Yayasan Purba Danarta

Miss Maria Francisca Viado — Abra Irrigation Project, Philippines

Miss Wiwik Andreani — Yayasan Purba Danarta

Mr. Stephan Puhl — Misereor

Dr. Angelita Yap Ledesma — Cendhrra

Dr. Antonio L. Ledesma — Cendhrra

Observers from the Institute of Social Research of Satya Wacana University, Salatiga:

Mr. Kutut Suwondo

Mr. Loeheor Wd. Adhinegara

Case Study no. 1. EVALUATION OF THE
SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM FOR
SOCIAL LEADERSHIP TRAINING OF
YAYASAN PURBA DANARTA, INDONESIA

Yayasan Purba Danarta (YPD) is an Indonesian development agency located in Semarang, Central Java. For over 15 years now, it has been the channel of funds for the scholarship programs of the following institutes:

Kursus Sosial Ekonomi Desa (KSED), located in Bandung, was founded in 1958 to train village women (between the ages of 17 to 40) in nutrition, cooking, gardening, traditional health care, literacy, home management, community development principles, etc. The courses run for three months with classes of 30 students each. From 1958 to 1978, KSED has produced 775 alumni.

Kursus Pertanian Taman Tani (KPTT) is located in Salatiga, Central Java, where it has facilities for training 30 farmers per session. It was started in 1965 to train pioneer farmers for one year in a curriculum where 60% of the time is devoted to field work in KPTT's rice fields and livestock farm. Courses given include techniques of farming and gardening, livestock breeding and animal husbandry as well as principles of the Pancasila, rural community development and mass communication. KPTT has graduated 399 farmers from 1965 to 1979.

Kursus Perkembangan Desa (KUPERDA) was founded in 1970 to educate community development leaders. At its Bogor, West Java campus, six-month courses are held for 20 to 30 students on topics covering adult education, group dynamics, yoga, socio-economic structure of rural society, personality development, credit union, home management, family health, etc. A senior high school diploma is part of the entrance requirements. In the past 3 years, the staff has travelled to the Moluccas and to West Irian to hold 6-month courses, KUPERDA has a total of 228 alumni since 1970.

Kursus Wiraswasta. This was founded in 1974 in Semarang to meet the training needs of the small entrepreneur. The course handles 15-25 students who can elect to take 3 units of one week each. The program units are: I. Small Management. II. Salesmanship. III. Achievement Motivation Training. Instructional methods make use of simulation, role-playing, problem solving approaches. A total of 722 students have taken one or more of the one-week units since 1974.

The direct object of the evaluation survey was the output of the scholarship program. The focus was on the impact of the alumni in the socio-economic development of rural communities. The chief indicators were the alumni's participation in rural development activities, the quality (in terms of appropriateness and creativity) of development projects in which they are involved.

A pre-tested questionnaire (*Buku Tinjauan*) was prepared to obtain alumni data on: their present socio-economic situation, their reading habits, their interest in national and provincial problems, their involvement in development programmes and participation in government, private, personal activities oriented towards solving rural community problems. There are also questions on how participants evaluated the courses they received in the above training institutes.

The questionnaire was answered at alumni reunions called regionally for the special purpose of reflecting on the issues raised by the *Buku Tinjauan*. An average of 11% of the alumni body of each institute attended a total of 10 reunions which were jointly organized by both the YPD research staff and the Institutes.

The active participation of the 4 Institutes covered all phases from the designing of the questionnaire, to the arrangement of regional reunions, to the counter-checking and critical review of the interpretations given by the research staff.

Besides the answering of the questionnaire in the reflection sessions on the occasion of the regional alumni reunions, the research staff travelled to Lampung, Manado, Flores, the Moluccas and Bali to conduct personal interviews with the alumni and with local community leaders in which the alumni worked.

The evaluation methodology suffered from the lack of control groups thereby making it difficult to conclude whether the achievements of the alumni could not have been caused by factors, such as maturation, other than the training they received from one of the Institutes. Furthermore, evaluation is comparative in nature. It needs reference points as to conditions prior to the training inputs in order to assess the extent of changes induced by the courses. Since the records of the alumni at the time of their entry made no mention of those characteristics picked out as the success indicators of this study, then once again "before and after" comparisons are not possible.

It was also noted that the questionnaire used was so long (with about 110 items to be answered in its 21 pages) that about 25% of the respondents had "no response" for the final items. Unfortunately, some of the key questions were placed in the last pages, such as alumni's awareness of the activities of other development agencies in their area, the respondents' evaluation of their most useful courses, what benefits they obtained from the training given them by the Institutes . . . It also would have helped if statistical tests of significance were used to determine the level of significance of the various differences noted in the study. Since the key researchers had changed jobs during the final phase of the study, the writing up of the final report and the meeting held to share results with all parties concerned, suffered as a consequence.

Conclusions

The 4 Institutes with YPD met in November 1979 to discuss policy implications arising from the survey data. Among the key conclusions agreed upon at this meeting were the following:

(a) *Profile of what a successful alumnus is.* A leader in his or her community as shown by his capacity to translate ideas into practice. Although personal influence is enhanced if the alumnus holds a position to which social status is traditionally ascribed (e.g. as teachers) still, there is no substitute for the graduates being able to show knowledge and practical abilities in areas seen as important by the local people.

(b) *Dependency of alumni on sponsors.* Since the scholarship programme covers 75% of the course costs, students need to be sponsored by an agency willing to meet the balance and in whose employment the student is normally committed after his graduation. YPD and the Institutes seem to feel that such a dependency may not be the ideal situation to promote initiative among prospective social leaders.

(c) *Recruitment problems.* Past recruitment procedures have led to the predominance of students coming from one religion, to a majority of KPTT students without the necessary land holdings to function as pioneer farmers, to large classes composed of teachers who, by comparison to other groups, have already been exposed to other training programs. To solve these past problems, KUPERDA is training more lay people while Wiraswasta, which has not been able to attract potential entrepreneurs, is re-designing its courses to focus on the practical skills needed for small business and to foster creative entrepreneurial attitudes.

(d) *Curricular improvements.* About 95% of the respondents considered the courses they received to be "useful" or "very useful". When asked what suggestions they had for improving the courses, the alumni indicated the need for "a higher level of education" in their farming program; that realistic problems be integrated into the simulation techniques; that more evaluation feedback be given to them as to their training performance.

(e) *Follow-up of alumni.* As more students graduate, the Institutes find themselves less capable of follow-up activities among their alumni. The responsible officials in the Institutes were divided in their thinking as to the necessity of providing "after-care" services to alumni. KUPERDA and KPTT try to maintain contacts with former students through regional centres, while KSED and Wiraswasta feel that too solicitous a follow-up creates continuing dependency of the student on his trainers. However, all agreed that alumni contacts keep the Institutes abreast of current field needs, thinking and developments.

(f) *Cooperation among the Institutes.* The joint meeting of the Institutes and YPD revealed specialties and resources that could be shared among them, for example, KUPERDA's group dynamics expertise, Wiraswasta's simulation techniques, KSED's home economics course, KPTT's materials on gardening. It is noteworthy that this evaluation project occasioned the first-ever meeting of all the Institutes and YPD.

(g) *Administrative structure.* The Board of Directors of the Institutes is seen as a vital element for creating stability, cooperation, continuity and for providing long-range planning. The weak performance in some of these areas by the Institutes is partly due to the passivity of the Boards. This often led to the assumption of policy-making powers on the part of the management staff with consequences on its accountability and planning roles.

CENDHRRRA's Recommendations

CENDHRRRA was invited by YPD to serve as external consultants to the above evaluation. It prepared the following recommendations to YPD and the Institutes concerned:

Guidelines for the Self-Evaluation of the Training Institutes

(1) *Recruitment of trainees.* Based on their objectives of training persons who are effective leaders in their local communities, the Institutes now possess valuable data contained in the evaluation report to further study the characteristics of their more effective alumni. This will have implications in improving their recruitment practices and selection priorities.

Some questions to help set up improved criteria for selecting students are:

- (a) Are trainees who are sent back to work in their own community more effective than those sent to communities other than their own?
- (b) What characteristics and policies of sending agencies lead towards more effective work by trainees they sponsored?
- (c) What personality traits, educational background or previous training experiences are characteristic of the more effective alumni?

Another consideration affecting the choice of trainees is the policy of the Institute regarding the nature of its follow-up activities for its alumni.

(2) *Training curricula.* A basic principle is that the curricula be based on actual development realities existing in the rural areas. KUPERDA's move to hold some of its training in rural sites is an example of its rootedness in rural realities. The participation of the alumni in improving curricula should be institutionalized. The evaluation report also underlined the need to balance theory with practice, to moderate concientization processes with practical projects that meet the basic needs of the poor. The alumni also expressed the need to be trained in evaluating their own work as well as to assess the socio-economic needs of their community.

(3) *Forming a social base.* If the Institutes' programs are to be rooted in rural realities and if follow-up activities are integrated into their total program offering, then they need a social base made up of a network of supporting agencies in the areas covered by their alumni. These agencies could be, for example, the various Social Delegates Committees, local development groups such as INDHERRA partners, sponsoring agencies, etc. Core groups of alumni from all 4 Institutes can comprise the social base in areas where an agency network is not feasible. The effectivity of this social base to support alumni activities is enhanced through information sharing, staff visits, exchange programs.

(4) *Cooperation among the Institutes.* This cooperation can be realized in such areas as: (a) sharing of information on course content; (b) staff exchanges; (c) formation of core alumni in priority areas; (d) regular meetings or seminars on common interests: e.g. evaluation of alumni, coordination of services at the village level, dialogue with sponsoring agencies, etc.

(5) *Board of Directors.* Its composition should reflect the range of needs and services offered by the Institutes. If an Institute specializes in educational inputs, then some key members of its Board

should be experienced educators. The Board membership of representatives of the principal sponsoring agencies might also be desirable. Its composition should also take into account the religious and cultural pluralism of the country. A sensitive balance should also be considered in the Board's composition so that not one group assumes dominance in its decision making.

(6) *The Faculty of the Institutes.* Among the questions to be considered are:

- (a) Is there a periodic evaluation of the faculty which incorporates self-assessment procedures as well as trainee observations?
- (b) Are criteria for faculty recruitment satisfactory for bringing in qualified and dedicated personnel?
- (c) Do the Institutes provide opportunities for staff development?
- (d) Can the 4 Institutes enter into staff exchange programs to maximize their manpower during slack periods? □

Case Study no. 2. IN-BUILT PARTICIPATIVE EVALUATION OF USAHA BERSAMA

Bambang Ismawan and M. Kusumahadi

The *Usaha Bersama* movement was introduced in 1968 in the island of Java to focus attention to the cooperative nature of village development.

The following describes certain characteristics of the *Usaha Bersama* organizations and their working processes, and the corresponding in-built evaluation, integrated in operational activities.

Based on Village Needs

Usaha Bersama (UB) is a term used to refer to a number of people who join together in some socio-economic activity in order to achieve a certain objective. It implies a sense of solidarity and readiness to share the benefits as well as hardships of the organization. Such UB groups arise from the presence of actual needs in a village. But they come into being not only because of these needs, but also because of local opportunities. The problem of off-harvest time

in some villages, for instance, has driven a number of men in the sixties to establish a joint-effort organization in storing rice stocks, collecting rice plants or cassava during harvest time and loaning them to those members in need during the off-harvest time. High interest rates in some localities brought about save and credit activities - collecting savings from their members and reloaning from the savings fund at a low interest rate. Various needs and problems have led local people to form UB groups; needs for capital and manpower in the beginning, gradually becoming needs for more knowledge, information, attitudes formation, technical skills, organizational and management practices.

For such activities, a promoter or catalyzer was needed. But the existence of those needs, and the availability of a hard-working catalyzer was not yet a guarantee for the establishment of a UB group. The understanding and support of local administrative officials was also important.

As self-reliant groups, they have a right to determine themselves the nature and manner of their work according to the challenges and encouragement found in their given situation. They also choose by consensus the persons who could best achieve their aims.

Servicing Unit Arises

As these UB groups grew in number and experience, it became necessary for them to come together to discuss their common problems, to formulate their aims, how they were formed and what their work guidelines were and other aspects of their experiences. Thus, in 1974 was established the *Lembaga Pembinaan Usaha Bersama* (LPUB), the Institute for Guidance in the Development of Usaha Bersama Organizations.

From this experience one sees that the UB groups grew spontaneously as a result of the mutual consent of several persons as initiators. They are as organizations self-relying, autonomous, and due to their origin and process of growth, unique. They are similar, but not equal since they find their place and role in differing situations.

But as self-relying organizations, they also need other organizations to help them in their growth and development. To spread their influence and set their example to a wider sphere, they need the assistance of an external catalyzer. The LPUB may be viewed as an integral part of their growth and maintenance.

Thus, the LPUB provides services to the UB groups related to matters of organization, administration, capital formation, business carried out by a

group, and also between groups, education and training, and social questions - rooting the idea of this village undertaking, and acceptance by a community.

The organizational links between the UB groups and the LPUB are the field workers, or *Pembina*, who live among the UB groups. Figuratively described as a "hinge", the field worker who may be overseeing about 40 UB units and who works closely with them, presents their aspirations and needs to the LPUB. In turn LPUB services are channelled through him to the UB groups. It is deemed important that the *Pembina* is committed both to the UB groups and the LPUB.

Evaluation Process

The evaluation mechanism is built into the entire structure through the system of participation. All individuals taking part in this work need to be brought along and sustained so that they can contribute according to their abilities as much as possible, to achieve the objective of the Movement. This is the underlying principle for the direct participation of people in the planning of UB activities at the base, within each UB group where local resources are pulled together. The local boards with the guidance of their field worker prepare their respective plans which are brought to a regional level planning sessions. After discussions and improvements of these plans, they are sent back to the local UB groups for confirmation, approval of the membership and subsequent adoption.

Results of regional planning sessions are presented at a national level meeting for all *Pembina* and the members of the LPUB for an overall planning workshop. The planning workshops or meetings, both at the level of the units of the *Usaha Bersama*, or inter-units, and at inter-regional level (national) always cover the following agenda points:

- (a) To conduct an evaluation of the prepared plans of the previous year. These are compared with actual achievements and deviations are then determined. Deviations are analyzed to find the causes. These are reconsidered in the preparation of the next plans.
- (b) Following in general a method of management by objectives, both UB organizations and the LPUB define their corresponding areas which are to be achieved.
- (c) Specific goals are set, as well as policies and strategies.
- (d) A matrix of the contributions of each person is then prepared. In this matrix is decided who is to be responsible for the achieve-

ment of particular objectives. Each one prepares an individual action plan, realizing its effects on the others.

The process of implementation of these plans is recorded and monitored by the Pembina and reports are sent every month to the LPUB. LPUB staff evaluates these reports and feedback is sent to the UB groups. The process of growth and development of UB groups is seen at close range through these reports. The staff also makes field visits once every three months; direct consultations are given as needs arise. This enables them to give guidance according to the plans which were jointly prepared.

To increase communication and sharing of information, a publication, *Setia Kawan* (solidarity) is circulated among the UB groups in the Movement.

LPUB realizes that this method of participation and internal evaluation needs to be continually improved, that the movement itself could thrive only as long as individuals involved take on their respective parts. The evaluation in the final analysis lies in the intensive interaction of the villagers themselves at the base, since it is their lives that are to be improved. As their capabilities increase, the movement continues.

Case Study no. 3. PLANNING FROM THE BOTTOM UP

Dr. Cheong Ji Woong

I. The CBIRD Concept

The community-based integrated rural development (CBIRD) program has the conventional objective of improving the condition of the poorest of the poor, the status of women and the welfare of youth. It shares the current international consensus that development should be (a) integrated, i.e., attacking a variety of problems simultaneously, and (b) community-based, i.e., involving maximum participation in a "bottom-up" approach to program planning, implementation and distribution of cost and benefits. CBIRD is also designed to harmonize with government's efforts in rural development.

The CBIRD strategy was devised and adopted by the Save the Children Federation/Community Development Foundation (SCF/CDF), a non-profit, sectarian voluntary organization conducting various assistance activities in less developed countries in Asia and the Pacific, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America.

II. Case Study in South Korea

The present study documents the CBIRD experience in South Korean "impact areas" where the strategy is recognized as functioning remarkably well.

Methodology. The case study, following the guidelines for investigation set by the International Council for Educational Development (ICED), critically evaluates the CBIRD program. It focuses on 5 vital issues, i.e., integration, community participation, voluntary organizations, education and reaching the poorest. It uses a multi-disciplinary research strategy and taps whatever available sources of relevant materials such as benchmark survey results, "single-subject" evaluations, unstructured interviews and actual observations. Employing the "systems analysis" approach, it views the program as a whole, encompassing (a) the geographic and socio-cultural context within which the program operates; (b) its philosophy, objectives, historical background, nature and targets; (c) its implementing organizational structure; (d) its financial capability; (e) its achievements, impacts and lessons, and (f) future directions.

Findings. The South Korean "impact areas" were selected on the basis of two complementary criteria: (1) their inaccessibility and poverty (relative to Korean standards) and (2) good potential for development in terms of natural and human resources.

The area is generally half or whole of a "myon" (township), the lowest South Korean administrative unit staffed by full-time government employees. The size of the area as a development unit is determined by the physical, socio-political, economic and other linkages that define common problems and needs, as well as cohesiveness of the affected villages. Thus, the impact area, covering 8 to 20 villages, is a mini-region one that the SCF/CDF considers big enough to contain ambitious and mutually reinforcing projects involving large initial capital investments. In this multi- or inter-village approach lies CBIRD's innovativeness.

Each impact area runs a CBIRD organizational system consisting of 3 major elements:

(1) *The Community Committee.* This is composed of individuals chosen by consensus decision to represent the population and interest of each member village. The committee formulates development plans and goals, implements and evaluates projects, and reports all its plans and activities to the people during annual general meetings.

(2) *The Field Coordinator.* He is a qualified field worker on the SCF/CDF. He is chosen in consultation with the local administration. He organizes the Committee initially, provides advice, and identifies resources and linkages with government agencies and other organizations.

(3) *The Community Center.* This is a multi-purpose building where people conduct meetings, trainings, recreational activities, health services and the like. It is conveniently located near many government offices. It is owned by the Committee and is registered under its name. It stands as a symbol of common ownership and facilitates community spirit.

CBIRD projects are generally of 2 types: (1) productivity or income-generating projects that include improvements in agricultural (or fishing) production and equipment, and (2) social infrastructure projects that include household improvements, health and sanitation activities, education and cultural projects, program management and public works.

In South Korea, CBIRD has the support of the government that launched throughout the country an intensive rural development program called *Saemaul Undong* (New Community Movement). The movement encourages cooperative self-help village projects and gives financial contributions to such projects. By pressuring village-level bureaucrats and employees to support these projects, the government's "top-down" system meets CBIRD's "bottom-up" approach.

Another supportive factor to the program is the composition of people in the impact areas. They are racially homogeneous and share a common culture. They have a high literacy rate and valuation for education. Moreover, their land-holdings are equitably distributed.

For its success, CBIRD claims that now farmers are better-off in food, clothing, travel, personal and household belongings and investments. Behind this success, however, CBIRD implicitly recognizes that the "bottom-up" approach fails to reach the poorest of the poor who lack even the minimum investments such as land or time that participation of the program entails. In this regard, the CBIRD experience cautions rural development planners from setting unrealistically high goals that can be achieved perhaps only through a drastic change in a country's socio-economic structure. □

Case Study no. 4. MERAPI SLOPES DRINKING WATER PROJECT

Richard Holloway

The parties involved in this project:

OXFAM is a British non-governmental agency. Its assistance policies require that project holders have to be involved with constant evaluation, self-monitoring and self-evaluation.

DIAN DESA is an Indonesian appropriate technology and village participation organization.

L.P.I.S., Satya Wacana University research group was involved in the field work.

McDonald and Partners are a British firm of civil engineers who happened to be working for the Indonesian Government.

The People of Merapi Slopes. There are about 33,000 people who live in this area. So far about 19,000 are affected by this drinking water project. The main crops are cassava and maize, with cloves as a cash crop. In the dry season, when the land is unproductive, there is migration to find work. In this season, all the water has to be carried, with a maximum of six hours walking time. There was a high incidence of diarrhea and skin diseases. There is little variation in income levels — people are fairly homogeneously poor.

Before 1977, Dian Desa had been involved in water-supply projects to villages. In 1977, Dian Desa approached Oxfam with a proposal to bring water to 14 villages in the Merapi slopes area over a two-year period, at the cost of US\$300,000. At that time there was currently being discussed a report of a similar water-supply project in Lesotho, where it had apparently failed to fulfill any of the objectives: the people were not healthier, not more productive and not better organized.

In the light of this, it was agreed to only fund a first year operation to three villages, at the cost of US\$100,000 and that a survey of the "before" and "after" situation should be carried out. The research group, L.P.I.S. was engaged to collect baseline data, and to do three further surveys at yearly intervals after the water had been supplied.

McDonald and Partners were asked to check out the technical capability of Dian Desa, and later the technical planning of the water-supply scheme.

Now we have the first report from the L.P.I.S. after the water has been in the villages for a ten-month period. The objectives of the project were:

- (a) To bring clean water to people's homes all the year round — to within 200 meters.

- (b) To free people from the burden of carrying water.
- (c) To reduce the incidence of water-borne diseases.
- (d) To create favorable conditions for increased productivity.

There was also a fifth unstated objective - and this was the hope that with improved living conditions, other benefits would emerge as one thing leads to another.

The results are as follows:

- (a) Because there is uneven distribution of water points, there has been some friction within the village.
- (b) The water management committees have not operated entirely successfully, and there has been a lot of wasted water. There has been friction about the management of the water.
- (c) The amount of water used for cooking has gone up a bit. There is increased frequency of washing bodies, but using the same amount of water. The frequency of washing clothes has remained the same, although a little more water is used for the washing.
- (d) The used water is being re-used to increase cash crops, and some fresh water is being utilized for this as well.
- (e) More people are now involved in the getting of water, although the total time involved in the collection of water has not altered.
- (f) The incidence of diarrhea among children has decreased.

Some other issues raised by this study:

- (a) The cost of the project for 19,000 people is US\$100,000. The cost of the baseline survey is US\$20,000. It must be asked if this is an acceptable level of expenditure, and who should bear the cost of such work.
- (b) What should be the balance between scientific evaluation and common-sense evaluation?
- (c) Is it acceptable to have some villages kept without water, in order to provide the necessary control group?
- (d) To what extent can the beneficiaries themselves carry out an evaluation? Are outsiders too unaware? Are insiders equipped?
- (e) The expectations of those who instigated the project and those who directly receive the benefits may be different. □

Case Study no. 5 UTILIZATION OF COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES

Ronaldo O. Rogel

Once health services are made available to people, it becomes equally important to study whether they are being used appropriately and adequately. To evaluate, therefore, the acceptance of health services by both users and potential users, a process of client analysis is needed. Through this approach, underlying issues connected with the utilization of health services can serve as a basis to measure service achievements. It would also give health planners, policy-makers and providers of health care an opportunity to recognize gaps in health service delivery.

Utilization of health services is influenced by the interplay of various factors which can be categorized into:

- (1) *Predisposing factors* - the characteristics of the health service consumers which set the stage for their motivation to utilize the health services. These include the household head's age, educational attainment, sex, awareness about the health services and its personnel, predisposition level (the stage when the household head decides to avail or utilize a health service in the face of a health crisis), and household size.
- (2) *Enabling factors* - the conditions which permit an individual, family or household to act on a value or to satisfy a need that requires health services. Some factors relate to the status of the family such as, family income, location of residence, occupation, place of work, nature of employment of household head, membership in health-related community organizations; others are factors bearing on the environment such as, accessibility of health services (location, hours of service), and approachability of health workers.

This study sought to examine the utilization of a health service facility in a rural community in Laguna, Philippines: the Comprehensive Community Health Program of the University of the Philippines System (UP-CCHP). It specifically attempted to determine the current ways and extent by which

the UP-CCHP health services were used to satisfy the need for health care; to describe the clientele's perceptions, attitudes and preferences in the use of health services; to identify the predisposing and enabling factors affecting its use; and to determine the extent by which the UP-CCHP health care delivery system was operational.

Structured interviews and a review of health service records were the main sources of data. All the households in the community under study were considered as the universe from where the sample respondents (10 percent) were drawn through a stratified random sampling technique. It was assumed that the sample-respondents were composed of both users and potential users of UP-CCHP health services. The choice of household heads as the principal respondents was based on the premise that they often make decisions at every stage of a household member's illness -- from diagnosis to treatment. The household served as the unit of analysis.

A period-of-recall technique was used during the interview in the course of eliciting utilization data. Two periods-of-recall, i.e., past one year and/or past four weeks, were considered during the date of interview. Because both crisis and curative orientations towards health care were noted to be prevalent in the community, utilization data relied heavily on reported episodes of illness, i.e., functional disability. Utilization of health services even without illness was, nevertheless, elicited. The data also covered the demographic characteristics of the respondents, their awareness regarding health care, attitude and perceptions towards health care (including their usual source and preferences).

For purposes of distinguishing users and non-users of UP-CCHP health services in particular, only those with reported episodes of illness in either or both periods of recall were included. Respondents with reported episodes but who availed of the services of other health facilities (other than UP-CCHP) were categorized as non-users. The corresponding utilization rate of each household with reported episodes of illness was likewise computed for purposes of comparison. This also gave an overall picture on the prevailing patterns of health services utilization in the community.

In brief, the results of the study have shown that if ever the need for care was present, households avail of the health services primarily for curative purposes. Regardless of the nature and condition of illness, the observed pattern of utilization in the face of a health crisis corresponds to their usual sources and preferences for health care. The pattern has likewise indicated no distinct relation between

illness and the appropriate level of care sought. With regard to health service facilities that were used, the proportion of those who availed of the UP-CCHP and those by the private sector and other government institutions approximated each other. Most of the non-users (of UP-CCHP) were either situated in the remote areas or were accessible to transport routes. This in effect showed that the decentralization of health services to reduce access barriers has increased the utilization of UP-CCHP as a health service facility.

Furthermore, results have shown these factors to have the highest degree of association with respect to the utilization of UP-CCHP: predisposition level, awareness about UP-CCHP, perceived distance and residential location. Other factors found to have a bearing on its use were: educational attainment of household head, type of occupation, annual household income, place and nature of work, membership in health related community organizations, perceived distance and availability of health services, and walking time to the nearest health center.

The findings of the study have the following implications:

- (1) In providing health services, there should be a balance of perceived health needs of people aside from what the agency defines as a real need.
- (2) Users of health services react to it as "in-accessible" if it becomes so sophisticated to the point that it is beyond their level of understanding.
- (3) Whatever perceived morbidity, there is at the individual or community level becomes the basis for most of the expressed demands for care. Besides, once decision to seek care is made, their regular source and preferences largely determine the type, amount and continuity of care.
- (4) Utilization of health care services go beyond geo-political boundaries. This suggests that health services and other related systems have to be functionally related with each other and the consumers.
- (5) Because of the many characteristics shared by other health and related agencies, a "regional balance" would be desirable. It is therefore often necessary to merge a number of communities in planning in order to have the best output and size of service area for each order of services provided by the various health facilities. □

Resource Paper no. 1. INDHRRRA's
PROJECT EVALUATION THROUGH
REPORTING SYSTEM

Djoko Aminoto

1. Report on the development of the project is used as a basic input for evaluation. The report should be prepared by the group or community participating in/benefitting from the project. The method to be used in formulating the report is through discussions among the participants (group members) all together on principal matters of common interest. The report contains the synthesis of the discussions. By thinking about and discussing those matters together, the group or community implementing the project will gain fresh insights which will make their work for development more effective. The information can serve as a sound basis for evaluation.
2. The questions discussed are usually as follows:
 - a. Who in general and how many people were involved in the actual implementation of the project?
 - b. In the course of implementing the project, did the people involved review the objectives of the project, their participation, the progress made, the benefits accrued, the role of foreign funds, etc.? If so, please note the salient points.
 - c. What if any, were the attitudes of people who were not involved in or benefitting from the project?
 - d. Could you give a frank indication of the ways in which the planning of the project and its implementation has been a process of education for change, for social justice, for human dignity, for socio-economic progress?
 - e. If the project has not been completed, can you see any further ways in which the project can contribute to foster the educative aspects mentioned above? If the project is completed, what steps are foreseen to give continuity to these aspects?
 - f. What other results have been achieved by this project; what others do you expect to achieve in the future?
 - g. Are these answers the sole work of the person signing the report or are they the result of discussion by a larger group? ☐

Resource Paper no. 2. COMMUNITY
LEVEL INFORMATION STATISTICS
SYSTEM

Dr. Jesus Montemayor

Community Level Information/Statistics System (CLISS), is a grassroots' information system in the sense that it is *of* or about the village communities, to be used *for* their well-being, and run primarily *by* them. CLISS adopts a sociologically oriented approach which views the village as a social system where people share a common culture or symbolic system and interact with one another on the basis of meanings that they give to things and events in their situation.

The CLISS concept developed from the rationale that genuine development takes into account people's participation at every phase of planning programs affecting their lives. An enlightened planning, in turn, requires information that these people have ready access to and can understand and meaningfully use. CLISS answers the need for relevant village-level, disaggregated and locally specific data for the villagers' deeper understanding of themselves.

CLISS has the following 3 main components:

(1) *Data-base*. This kind of data largely depends on what information the community wants and for what purpose. The core of the data-base system, however, includes: (a) *general information* about the village, i.e., its history, physical environment, resources and facilities, profile of its population; (b) its *social system*, i.e., social structure, basic social institutions and organizations, social stratification, social processes such as access and control of resources, and (c) its *cultural system* reflecting people's perception, definition of local concepts, and interpretation of their own symbols and value preferences. CLISS, thus, views the society in its entirety and collects data primarily as they relate to group living. It aims to capture the dynamics of an enterprise as social and, in the case of farming, for example, not just agronomic.

(2) *Machinery*. This consists of an organization and a set of processes, activities and outputs. A CLISS expert or extension agent, in consultation with the village opinion leaders, initially explains the CLISS concept to the people. He organizes and mobilizes the people for participation. The people form a cadre composed of selected key

persons representing a cross-section of village groups and possibly incorporating representatives from government agencies and non-governmental organizations. The cadre undergoes training in the CLISS which consists of developing and administering data-gathering instruments (survey schedules, questionnaires, guidelines, checklists, etc.) and of data-processing, tabulation, analysis and interpretation. The cadre takes the lead in involving people in the CLISS operation, providing all the opportunity to evaluate the findings (basic statistics may be explained to the people) and the responsibility to assess their own problems. The machinery is responsible for the systematic data-recording, storage, maintenance and retrieval of the acquired information.

(3) *Management Information System (MIS)*. The MIS sees that a self-sustaining CLISS proceeds efficiently and well. The system consists of a data-flow chart, trained reporters, report-format and report-receivers. The report-receivers are primarily the village council. Other report-receiving linkages are the National Statistical System and Ministry-based information systems whose own staff can do their own aggregation of village-level data.

The usefulness of the CLISS may be summarized as follows:

- (1) It focuses information in the village where development is expected to take place.
- (2) It treats village people as responsible participating partners or operators, not passive clients, of development.
- (3) It promotes people's initiative in all levels of program planning and execution, with the government and extension agent only assisting.
- (4) It provides the needed feedback mechanism by linking the village with the government or appropriate authorities.
- (5) It bridges bottom-up and macro-level planning approaches.
- (6) It brings people in the frontline capable of exacting accountability from the government agencies.
- (7) It enhances cooperative spirit and a sense of community, and
- (8) It cultivates a sense of historical continuity.

(In early 1979, a CLISS for Agrarian Reform and Rural Poor Development Project was launched in an FAO-ASSARD Small Farmers Development Project site in the Philippines. The test shows the CLISS as feasible, urgently needed and welcomed by the people although it still needs refinements.) □

INCIDENTAL THOUGHTS ON EVALUATION GATHERED IN BANDUNGAN

A Foreign Observer

1. What we need to rediscover is the comprehensive view of life. The single sciences on different topics may be a help but they cannot produce a comprehensive knowledge about the world, man and life. Whereas the single sciences do not care to express anything unless previously having proved its contents, the comprehensive sciences (philosophy and theology) are aiming at not omitting anything, the lack of which could falsify the whole.
2. Europe and the United States of today are not representative for the West or for Christianity. They are a spoilt version. The western scientists have been most successful in cutting off the spiritual roots of the West since the 16th century. Those who cannot understand the Asian view of life are also those who are unable to "evaluate" a Gothic cathedral or a symphony of Beethoven.
3. I believe in the fundamental and indestructible unity of mankind and in one stem which guarantees mutual understanding and a bridge over all gaps and gulfs besides the (legitimate and fruitful) functional variety of branches of our humanity in space and time. Tensions may be good and fruitful, division is not. Contest and competition, as long as they don't break down communication and lead to hatred or destruction, is wonderful. Isn't there a difference between competition and the so-called rat-race?
4. Be careful of poor concepts that are disguised by high ideals; e.g. a concept of justice which is defined more as the balance of envy and selfishness: "No one gets more than me; no one grows richer than me." Is the justice called for by the "have-nots" necessarily oriented by the standards of the "haves" as a yardstick for happiness? Are those trapped in the "rat-race" the symbols of our idea of justice? In classical times, European thinkers distinguished *justitia distributiva*, *justitia legalis* and *justitia commutativa*. Do we have any access to justice which is beyond simple distribution?

Another example: freedom. Is it the simple lack of ligature which necessarily ends up in violence and anarchy? Is true freedom only that which liberates us from hunger, poverty, sickness? What of the other constraints and contingencies

arising from man's constitution? Is freedom destructive?

5. Were our grandparents underprivileged only because they didn't know civil divorce, central heating, holidays on Tenerife, easy jetting to other continents? Are the tribes of Papua New Guinea underprivileged because they do not know these things even today? Are we creating new "basic needs" by advanced technology?
6. It is not legitimate to reduce man to needs and quantitative questions. This would mean to dismantle his cultural, social, religious and other dimensions that are inalienable in order to safeguard his vital unity. Would you hire a butcher in order to evaluate a racing horse? A geologist in order to evaluate Borubodur? A TUC senior staff member in order to evaluate the performance of a boys' choir at Christmas night?
7. The ratios of input to output or of cost to benefit are a possible measure for economic achievements or failures; but they must never be the means of measurement at all unless the value is the same as the price, achievement is equivalent to success, and the market becomes the only life space for human beings. Blunt pragmatism allows creativity only as long as it leads to higher productivity or profit.
8. Evaluation should not be equivalent to dissecting and an evaluator must not be a vivisectionist unless he considers the persons concerned — responsible people for the project and the beneficiaries of the project — his guinea pigs; these groups of persons should not fall victims to the thirst for knowledge of so-called evaluators. That would be a baffling concept of evaluation.
9. Evaluations and their methods should be improved. The struggle for this improvement could not exhaust itself solely in tackling the scientific methods of evaluation. The struggle should moreover be concerned with bringing in other methods in order to complement and supplement the scientific point of view.
10. The whole area of social development is in question, not only one of its aspects, e.g. evaluation or self-reliance or cooperation techniques, etc. All these different topics are only various aspects of one and the same process: dialogue and above all, intercultural dialogue.
11. Before we enter into dialogue, each one has to find his own language for an authentic self-definition; each one must find self identity without borrowing ideas from abroad. A strong

and self-confident self-consciousness is a *conditio sine qua non* for a dialogue between equal partners. In the core of this self-consciousness there are things that cannot be negotiable; the summit of a real dialogue can be silence.

12. Respect and self-respect, the precise definition of each one's field of original and inalienable responsibility make it possible to share responsibility. A joint venture is only possible between individuals daring to take personal risks; only he who bears solitude is prepared for togetherness.
13. Partners should not always look for complete harmony; though it be only a partial consensus, whether little or large, it should be enough for a limited cooperation and partnership. Do not exceed in your expectations; compromises sometimes are a sign of strength not of weakness. □

EVALUATION APPREHENSIONS

Undergoing an evaluation is sometimes similar to going to a dentist; one fears the exploring drill might probe deep into a painful cavity. What are some of the apprehensions that NGOs have regarding evaluation? These include (a) the timing of an evaluation; (b) the doubtful usefulness of evaluations; (c) the discontinuity between internal program planning and summative evaluations; (d) the inadequacy of present evaluation instruments to judge the essence of a project.

Timing. Most evaluations initiated by donor agencies come at the final phase of a project. This is usually the time when decisions on funding support are being made, a period when project staff feel they are on the vulnerable end of a judgmental process. Moreover, since evaluation involves comparing an "after" picture with a "before" picture — project staff might feel that not enough time interval has elapsed to make an adequate comparison.

Usefulness of Evaluation Results. Many project holders complain that evaluation results are either not shared with them or published in language too technical for them to comprehend in terms of practical implications. Often, the evaluation process takes so much time (one to three years) that by the time it is concluded, the results are outdated. The question has also been raised as to whether project staff can obtain the initial raw data of an evaluation before their final processing in order that the project personnel can arrive at their own conclusions.

Formative and Summative Evaluations. Formative evaluation is the day-to-day process of project plan-

ning and management which involves selecting of limited goals and designing specific means to shape and reshape a project to meet its daily problems. Some have called this the managerial "science of muddling through." On the other hand, summative evaluation comes at the end of a project to pass judgment on whether it attained its objectives and had any significant impact.

To help reduce the apprehension of project staff over summative evaluations, its processes should be linked with formative evaluation so that both are seen as complementary rather than competing processes. Those in charge of summative evaluations cannot afford to ignore the internal feedback, monitoring and course correction processes that most projects have established. A serious effort to base summative evaluations on the wealth of data generated in the daily process of tuning up a project will make it easier for all concerned to enter evaluation in a spirit of cooperation and partnership.

Objectivity and Subjectivity. Because projects operate in unstable conditions and not within the controlled environment of a laboratory, the application of strict experimental approaches is not possible. At the same time, tough questions need to be asked to assess the effectiveness of project inputs, to discover causal relationships that can become the foundation for extensions or replications of the present project. Thus, a careful blending of quantitative and qualitative measurements is called for. This perhaps is easier achieved if the evaluation is administered by an interdisciplinary team. Moreover, the evaluation process should be designed so as to evoke the participation and commitment of the project staff and recipient groups.

Finally, A Word to Donors. Nothing reveals better the quality of a donor's relationship with its Third World partners than the moment when an evaluation is called for. If funding has been the main ingredient in this relationship, then the evaluation will be characterized by hard bargaining between unequals: the superior sternly demanding an accounting from the inferior. If true partnership has been the essence of the relationship, then, there are better guarantees of an open dialogue and a learning process benefitting both donor and recipient groups.

Donor organizations have amassed a wealth of data regarding successful and unsuccessful project experiences. If this material were to be analyzed and presented to project holders, a high degree of learning will occur. A comprehensive and comparative picture of project problems, phases and possible solutions will emerge. Such presentations would increase not only knowledge, but also the breadth and depth of partnership between donors and recipients which relies primarily on the sharing of experiences. □

WILL THE REAL PROJECT PLEASE STAND UP AND BE EVALUATED?

One major reason why it is difficult to evaluate NGO rural projects is their assuming of roles and functions alien to the essence of a development instrument. How design an evaluation for a training project whose real aim is not to form farmer leaders but political cadres? Or for a project that caters more to enhance the personal ambitions of its promoters? How evaluate a development strategy molded to fit academic requirements rather than the realities of village life?

There is need to peel away these alien layers and to discover once more the simple essence of a development project. A project is but a humble tool to service the rural poor. This it does, not by imposing political, religious or cultural pre-conditions, but by liberating the human potentials of the poor from the constraints of injustice, prejudice and ignorance. A project that is a straightforward project is easier to evaluate than one that promotes confounding factors like paternalism and subservience. It also serves the poor more effectively.

Another imposed burden on the project is the expectation that it meet global criteria. Projects are rejected because structural analysis has shown their inability to link with macro-theories. Projects are deliberately kept on a low level of efficiency while waiting out the coming of a more ideal national structure. Project implementation is slowed down because it is claimed that the target group has not yet attained that degree of conscientization set forth by a Freire or an Alinsky. Yet, all a project desires to be in order to assert its true self, is to be allowed to plot out a limited environment (not the entire country) where its humble activities can promote workable solutions. Projects of NGO's were not meant to directly grapple with international and national forces. Their style is basically incrementalist rather than revolutionary.

One possible practical result of this incrementalist approach is to lessen the number of hours spent on implementing processes based on sophisticated structural analyses and conscientization theories and instead, to putting more time to listen to the farmers themselves. Often, the farmers have a better reading of their real problems and their possible solutions. Moreover, less efforts might be wasted on publishing glowing reports meant only to impress donors but whose accounts bear little relationship to the slow, difficult realities of rural development work. Perhaps, there will be less one-day visits by donor agents beguiled by local ideologists more eager to promote a political cause than to solve the poverty of rural communities.

CENDHRRRA'S EVALUATION SERVICES

It is not always easy for project holders in Asia to obtain evaluation literature. Therefore, CENDHRRRA offers its partners an evaluation service which consists in: (1) answering questions on evaluation techniques appropriate for their project; (2) meeting with local evaluation experts who can directly advise them; (3) obtaining evaluation literature. These services will come not only from the secretariat but especially from its network contacts in the various countries and who have experience in evaluating development projects.

We would like to mention here some evaluation literature that helped us in preparing the Bandungan evaluation seminar.

- (1) *Project Evaluation Methodologies and Techniques*. Constantin G. Soumelis. Published by UNESCO, 1977. This monograph has practical discussions on the function of evaluation, the various problems involved in evaluation design and the sequence of steps to be followed plus examples of evaluation designs for an educational project. It is primarily concerned with the managerial function of evaluation seen as a process through which a decision-maker is informed of the development of a project's activities, its impact, and its performance when operating in order to bring about corrective measures.
- (2) *The Application of Quasi-Experimental Methodologies to the Design and Evaluation of Foreign Assistance Projects*. Brian L. Job. Monograph of a study made by the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities, 1976. Published by A.I.D. R & D Report Distribution Center, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Harbor, Michigan, 48106 U.S.A.

This study attempts to bridge the gap between the practitioner and theoretician concerning the quasi-experimental methods as an alternative to the impractical use of strict experimental methods in evaluating projects. It presents designs that avoid threats to validity

and are adaptable for use in projects assisted from the outside.

- (3) *Adaptive Field-Testing for Rural Development Projects*. Craig V. Olson. Handbook published by: Development Alternatives, Inc. 1825 Jefferson Place, N.W., Washington D.C. 20036, U.S.A.

Adaptive field-testing may be defined as a process of "experimentation" conducted within the context of an ongoing project, which aims at predicting with greater certainty the outcome of an intervention. It is a way of testing the effectiveness of a single technology or of choosing among competing technologies or interventions. This handbook proposes the adaptive field-testing approach as a methodological option with respect to problems of research design, sampling, and data collection. It presents likewise a logical process to follow in project experimentation that has implications for evaluators.

- (4) *Evaluation in Rural Community Education: The State-of-the-Art*. Theo. James Pinnock et al. Published 1978 by the Office of International Programs, Human Resources Development Center, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, U.S.A.

This study is a review of the literature on methodologies and instruments for evaluating community education programs. It has three parts: an overview of concepts related to community development and nonformal education together with a review of evaluation concepts, designs and methodologies; a presentation of selected case studies and evaluation of community education in 6 developing countries and finally, a composite of variables and indicators for evaluating rural community education programs in the Third World.

- (5) *An Approach for Assessing Rural Development Projects*. Part I. Basic Framework and Methodology. H. Albert Green. Published 1976 by the International Statistical Programs Center, Bureau of Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington D.C. 20233. □

Antonio L. Ledesma
Angelita Y. Ledesma

Editors

Evelyn T. Deles
Edvilla Talaroc

Staff

The Development Memo is published as an information service by the Centre for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Asia (CENDHRRRA) for its network partners. Mailing address: P.O. Box 458, Greenhills, San Juan, Metro Manila, Philippines. Telephone: 828-3262
